



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,612	02/10/2004	Edward Melomed	MS307299.1/MSFTP605US	1584
27195	7590	10/29/2007	EXAMINER	
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP			SAIN CYR, LEONARD	
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER				
1900 EAST NINTH STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CLEVELAND, OH 44114			2626	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/29/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@the patent attorneys.com
hholmes@the patent attorneys.com
osteuball@the patent attorneys.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/775,612	MELOMED ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Leonard Saint-Cyr	2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 08/20/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither Liddy et al., nor Park et al., teach utilizing context information to facilitate a linguistically accurate translation of a data after it is retrieved (Amendment, pages 8 – 12).

The examiner disagrees, Liddy et al., teach that this does not mean, however, that retrieved documents could not then be translated, by machine or otherwise, if deemed appropriate by the user. Using the original language of the input text as a useful context for selecting the most appropriate sense of the words in a sentence. Each machine translation will process source documents to create a given translation without human intervention or aid (col.7, lines 18 – 21; col.11, lines 56 – 58; col.22, lines 46 – 48). Translating retrieved documents by machine translation implies utilizing context information to facilitate a linguistically accurate translation of a data after it is retrieved, since original language of the input text is used as a useful context for selecting the most appropriate sense of the words in a sentence.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1- 30, 33 –37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Liddy et al., (US Patent 6,006,221).

As per claims 1, 11, 22, and 35, Liddy et al., teach a data translation system comprising:

an interface component that receives requests for data from a user (“enable a user to enter a query”; col.2, lines 43 – 45); and

a translation component that retrieves data in accordance with the requests and returns the data to the user in a specified language, the translation component comprising an inference component that, upon retrieval, translates result data into one or more languages, the inference component including a context analyzer component to provide a linguistically accurate translation (“this does not mean, however, that retrieved documents could not then be translated, by machine or otherwise, if deemed appropriate by the user. Using the original language of the input text as a useful context for selecting the most appropriate sense of the words in a sentence. Each machine translation will process source documents to create a given translation without human intervention or aid”; col.7, lines 18 – 21; col.11, lines 56 – 58; col.22, lines 46 – 48).

As per claim 2, Liddy et al., further disclose a language identification component that determines the specified language of a user (col.7, line 26).

As per claim 3, Liddy et al., further disclose a conversion component that receives data requests in a plurality of different formats and converts the requests into executable queries on data (“accepts raw, unformatted text and transfers this to a standard format suitable”; col.8, lines 42 – 45).

As per claims 4, 12, 23, Liddy et al., further disclose that the request is a structured query in the user's preferred language (“enter queries in the user's native language”; col.2, lines 52 - 54).

As per claims 5, 13, 26, Liddy et al., further disclose that the request is a natural language request (col.2, lines 44, and 45).

As per claims 6, 15, 24, Liddy et al., further disclose that the translation component comprises: one or more translation tables; and a mapping component that maps retrieved data to its corresponding translation in a translation table (fig.4 shows translation tables that map French words to English words; col11, lines 13 – 15; col.15, lines 42 – 49).

As per claims 7, 16, Liddy et al., further disclose that the translation tables are set up by a database administrator (“multilingual mapping terminology managers”; col.13, 18, and 19; col.22, lines 50 – 53).

As per claim 8, Liddy et al., further disclose that the translation component comprising and inference component that can translate result data into one or more languages (“only those few documents that obtain a high relevance ranking ... become candidates for full translation”; col. 22, lines 22 – 25).

As per claims 9, 17, 25, Liddy et al., further disclose that the inference component including a dictionary component to facilitate data translations (col.11, lines 32, and 60 – 64).

As per claim 10, Liddy et al., further disclose that the context analyzer receives metadata associated with result data (“meta-textual”; col.22, lines 27 – 29).

As per claims 14, 27, 36, Liddy et al., further disclose that the database is a multidimensional database (“database that includes documents in at least one other language of the plurality of supported languages”; col.2; lines 46 – 48).

As per claim 18, Liddy et al., further disclose a sort component that receives collation information from a user and sorts resulting data in accordance with the collation information (“components in a query tend to occur in a certain repetitive sequence... documents are arranged in ranked order according to their relative relevance to the substance of a query”; col.17, lines 12, and 13; col.18, lines 35 – 37).

As per claim 19, Liddy et al., further disclose that the collation information includes the language to be used for sorting (“enter queries in the user’s native language”; col.2, lines 52 - 54).

As per claim 20, Liddy et al., teach an online analytical processing (OLAP) system comprising: an interface component to receive queries (“enable a user to enter a query”; col.2, lines 43 – 45)

a translation component that retrieves data and metadata from a multidimensional database (“database that includes documents in at least one other language of the plurality of supported languages”) in accordance with a query and translates resulting data and metadata from a system base language into one or more user languages (“machine translation of relevant documents”; col.22, lines 30 – 37; col.2, lines 46 – 48);

wherein the translation component comprising an inference component that, upon retrieval, translates result data into one or more languages, the inference component including a context analyzer component to provide a linguistically accurate translation (“this does not mean, however, that retrieved documents could not then be translated, by machine or otherwise, if deemed appropriate by the user. Using the original language of the input text as a useful context for selecting the most appropriate sense of the words in a sentence. Each machine translation will process source documents to create a given translation without human intervention or aid”; col.7, lines 18 – 21; col.11, lines 56 – 58; col.22, lines 46 – 48).

As per claim 21, Liddy et al., further disclose that the translation component maps resulting data and metadata to a translation table to produce translated data and metadata (fig.4 shows translation tables that map French words to English words; col11, lines 13 – 15; col.15, lines 42 – 49).

As per claims 28, 37 Liddy et al., further disclose that a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carrying out the method of claim 22 (col.4, lines 25 – 27).

As per claim 29, Liddy et al., teach a method of translating database data comprising:

receiving a language selection (“enter queries in the user’s native language”; col.22, lines 52 – 54);

receiving a query in a first format; converting the query to a second format (“accepts raw, unformatted text and transfers this to a standard format suitable”; col.8, lines 42 – 45);

executing the query on a database; and translating received result data to the selected language; and utilizing context information to provide a linguistically accurate translation (“this does not mean, however, that retrieved documents could not then be translated, by machine or otherwise, if deemed appropriate by the user. Using the

original language of the input text as a useful context for selecting the most appropriate sense of the words in a sentence. Each machine translation will process source documents to create a given translation without human intervention or aid"; col.7, lines 18 – 21; col.11, lines 56 – 58; col.22, lines 46 – 48).

As per claim 32, Liddy et al., further disclose translating the result data comprises mapping data and meta-data to a translation table associated with the selected language (fig.4 shows translation tables that map French words to English words; col11, lines 13 – 15; col.15, lines 42 – 49).

As per claim 33, Liddy et al., further disclose sorting the translated data based on collation properties specified by a user ("components in a query tend to occur in a certain repetitive sequence... documents are arranged in ranked order according to their relative relevance to the substance of a query"; col.17, lines 12, and 13; col.18, lines 35 – 37).

As per claim 34, Liddy et al., further disclose that a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carrying out the method of claim 29 (col.4, lines 25 – 27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 38 – 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al., (US Patent 6,064,951), in view of Liddy et al., (US Patent 6,006,221).

As per claim 38, Park et al., teach a method of interacting with a database comprising: specifying a command in a first language; receiving the command and translating the command into a second language; and performing an operation on a database in accordance with the command (generating translations of the input query... and a transformed query memory unit for storing the query transformed from the source language into a target language"; col.2, lines 19 – 34).

However Park et al., do not specifically teach utilizing context information to facilitate translations in at least one of the performance of the operation on the database or translation of a queried result, upon retrieval, to provide a linguistically accurate translation.

Liddy et al., teach that this does not mean, however, that retrieved documents could not then be translated, by machine or otherwise, if deemed appropriate by the user. Using the original language of the input text as a useful context for selecting the most appropriate sense of the words in a sentence. Each machine translation will

process source documents to create a given translation without human intervention or aid (col.7, lines 18 – 21; col.11, lines 56 – 58; col.22, lines 46 – 48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to translate the retrieved documents as taught by Liddy et al., in view of Park et al., so that the retrieved documents can be clearly understood by different groups of people.

As per claim 39, Park et al., further disclose that the command is to store a data in the database (“memory unit for storing the query transformed from the source language into a target language”; col.2, lines 32 – 34).

As per claim 40, Park et al., further disclose translating the command into a second language includes translating a natural language command into a structured command in the base language of the system (“translations of the input query and filtering unnecessary ones of the generated translations”; col.2, lines 27 – 32).

As per claim 41, Park et al., further disclose that a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carrying out the method of claim 38 (“electronic dictionary”; col.2, lines 29 – 32).

6. Claims 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy et al., (US Patent 6,006,221) in view of Park et al., (US Patent 6,064,951).

As per claim 31, Liddy et al., further disclose the first query format is in a first language ("enter queries in the user's native language"; col.2, lines 52 - 54).

However Liddy et al., do not specifically teach that the second query format is in a second language.

Park et al., teach a translation/and filtering unit for generating translations of the input query and filtering unnecessary one of the generated translations (col.2, lines 27 - 29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transform the input query as taught by Park et al., in Liddy et al., because that would generate a desired query usable as an input for the web information retrieval system (col.2, lines 17, and 18).

As per claim 31, Liddy et al., further disclose that the first query format is a natural language query (col.2, lines 44, and 45).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonard Saint-Cyr whose telephone number is (571) 272-4247. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LS
10/17/07



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER